

# Environmental Services Accounts Payable Follow – Up Audit No. A2012-03

Issued by the Internal Audit Office February 20, 2012

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Internal Audit Office conducted a Follow-Up Audit on the Environmental Services Accounts Payable Audit Report dated April 23, 2010. The original Audit Report contained (4) four findings. Based on the results of this Follow-Up Audit, we have determined that (3) three of the four original findings have been implemented, and (1) one is still in progress of being fully implemented. We have determined the status of the recommendation for each audit finding as outlined in the table below:

Finding		
No.	Description of Findings	Status
1	Environmental Services' Accounts Payable function is not obtaining a consistent indication of Management's approval for payment on invoices 69.70% of the time. We noted invoices with a set of initials and date only which is not a clear indication of approval. We also indentified invoices that had an "Approved By" stamp with signature and date blocks which clearly indicates an approval.	Implemented
2	Environmental Services' Accounts Payable function is not processing transactions or paying invoices in a timely manner 31.82% of the time.	Implemented
3	Environmental Services' Accounts Payable function is not reconciling Travel Requests 66% of the time.	In Progress
4	Environmental Services' Accounts Payable function is not verifying or recalculating invoices.	Implemented

For a detailed explanation of the findings and current observations please refer to the appropriate finding contained in the body of this Audit Report.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, Standard 4.05 and 6.36, and the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, Standard 2500.A1, require a post audit follow-up on all audit recommendations made in order to ascertain that appropriate corrective action is taken to address reported audit findings. The Internal Audit Office has conducted a Follow-Up Audit of the Environmental Services Accounts Payable Report dated April 23, 2010.

## **AUDIT OBJECTIVES**

The audit objective was to determine the status of the recommendations detailed in the original Audit Report dated April 23, 2010, which contained four (4) findings.

#### **AUDIT SCOPE**

The Follow-Up Audit was limited to a review of the four (4) findings and recommendations detailed in the "Environmental Services Accounts Payable Audit" dated April 23, 2010. The audit period covered the operations of the Environmental Services Department Accounts Payable function from September 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011.

#### **AUDIT METHODOLOGY**

To achieve our audit objectives we:

- Obtained an understanding of the City of El Paso's Accounts Payable Manual (dated July 2011) and Travel Manual (dated November 2007).
- Identified for review 20 invoices processed by the Environmental Services Accounts Payable function to determine if:
  - Consistent evidence of Management's approval is being obtained prior to payment of invoices,
  - o Invoices are being paid in a timely manner,
  - Supervisors or authorized officials are reviewing invoices for compliance with quoted prices prior to payment of invoices.
- Reviewed two Travel Requests to determine if the Environmental Services Department is properly reviewing Travel Requests.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with <u>Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards</u>. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

This audit was also conducted in conformance with the <u>International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing</u> by the Institute of Internal Auditors.

## ORIGINAL FINDINGS, ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS, MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE TO ORIGINAL FINDINGS, CURRENT OBSERVATION, AND STATUS

Based on the results of follow-up test work, each original finding recommendation will be designated with one of the following four status categories:

Implemented	The finding has been addressed by implementing the original corrective	
Implemented	action or an alternative corrective action.	
In Progress	The corrective action has been initiated but is not complete.	
Not Applicable	The recommendation is no longer applicable due to changes in procedures or	
Not Applicable	changes in technology.	
Not Implemented	The recommendation was ignored, there were changes in staffing levels, or	
Not Implemented	management has decided to assume the risk.	

## **Original Finding 1**

## **Invoices**

The number of vouchers processed for the period September 1, 2009 through December 22, 2009 was 664. We selected a random 10% sample of 66 transactions for review.

Based on our review of 66 invoices, the Environmental Services Accounts Payable function is not obtaining consistent evidence of Management's approval for payment of 46 out of 66 invoices (69.70%).

	No. of		Invoice
Invoice Review	Invoices	Amounts	Percentages
Invoices with Management Approval Stamp,			
Signature & Date.	20	\$209,737.95	30.30%
Invoices without clear indication of			
Management Approval (initials and date only).	46	\$303,587.48	69.70%
Total	66	\$513,325.43	100.00%

## Recommendation

Environmental Services Accounts Payable function should comply with the City of El Paso's Accounts Payable Manual section 3.0 paragraph 3, which requires invoices to be reviewed for compliance with quoted prices prior to payment. The supervisor, or authorizing official, should sign off on the document to ensure that there is evidence of compliance with the contract or quoted prices.

## **Management's Response**

In accordance with the City of El Paso's Accounts Payable Manual section 3.0 paragraph 3, all invoices reviewed were "documented either by a signature or by initializing of the invoice." Environmental Services Department (ESD) is compliant. However, some invoices utilized a standard stamp while others were approved with the stamp (signature/initials and date only). Accounts Payable clerks have been instructed to consistently show supervisor authorization via the standardized stamp with signature of the supervisor/authorized person. This will more clearly and consistently document our compliance with Accounts Payable Manual section 3.0 paragraph 3 which requires an indication of management approval.

## **Responsible Party**

Alfredo Chavez, (Acting) Senior Accountant

## **Implementation Date**

June 1, 2010

## **Chief Internal Auditor's Response**

In reviewing the results of our analysis, the invoices in question only contain an initial and date. The initial and date do not indicate an approval was authorized for payment. Invoices that contain the rubber stamp with a signature/initial and date do indicate an approval for payment of the invoices. Therefore, the Environmental Services Department is not in full compliance with the criteria established in the Accounts Payable Manual Section 3.0, Paragraph 3.

## **Current Observation**

A review of 20 invoices was conducted to determine if the Environmental Services Department has been obtaining consistent evidence of Management's approval before payment of invoices. The results of our testing are outlined below:

- 18 out of 20 (90%) invoices reviewed had approvals for payment from a supervisor or an authorized official. These invoices were approved with a Management Approval Stamp, signature, and date.
- 2 out of 20 (10%) invoices reviewed did not have Management's approval for payment.
  - The total amount identified without an approval was \$327.31 (0.21%) of the \$157,997.00 reviewed. The unapproved amount is considered immaterial and no further follow up will be conducted.

#### **Status**

Implemented

## **Original Finding 2**

## **Transactions Processed In A Timely Manner**

Based on our review of 66 invoices, the Environmental Services Accounts Payable function is not processing transactions or paying invoices in a timely manner in 21 out of 66 instances (31.82%).

The results of our review is as follows:

Environmental	Number of invoices	Number of invoices	Amounts Overdue	Interest Due to	Percent of invoices
<b>Services Division</b>	reviewed	overdue	Invoices	Vendors	overdue
Compliance	6	3	\$137.85	\$0.10	50.00%
Solid Waste					
Management	29	9	\$6,889.09	\$19.08	31.03%
Engineering	31	9	\$165,879.91	\$204.25	29.03%
Totals	66	21*	\$172,906.85	\$223.43	31.82%

<sup>\* 10</sup> of the overdue Invoices were from the same vendor (Northern Imports) for the purchase of safety shoes.

## Recommendation

Environmental Services Accounts Payable function should comply with the Texas' Prompt Payment Law of 1987. Texas Government Code Sec. 2251.021 states payment is overdue on the 31<sup>st</sup> day after the later of:

- The date the City of El Paso receives the goods under contract.
- The date the performance of the services under contract is completed or,
- The date the City of El Paso receives an invoice for the goods or services.

## **Management's Response**

During the period under review ESD had a change of personnel in the Accounts Payable division. Invoices were being addressed to individuals instead of to the division. In reference to Northern Imports, 47.6% of the late payments, the invoices were misdirected by the vendor. Instead of being mailed to ESD, they were mailed to City Hall. Upon receipt of a monthly statement it was determined that not all invoices were re-directed from City Hall to ESD. Consequently, by the time invoice copies were acquired, the 30 days to pay had lapsed.

To help reduce the possibility of misdirection of invoicing ESD will instruct all vendors to address invoicing to "Accounts Payable" when using USPS or to an "Accounts Payable – ESD" email account when invoicing via internet. This will avoid mail from following staff persons who may have been reassigned to other departments/locations or who may be out on leave.

All invoices by mail and internet will be logged in a spreadsheet and delivered to an Accounts Payable clerks. The Accounts Payable clerk will distribute the invoices to the appropriate supervisor/authorized person to review for compliance with quoted prices based on the contract and approve payment. The supervisors/authorized persons have been instructed to return the invoice in a timely manner to the Accounts Payable clerk who will reconfirm the amounts. All supervisors/authorized personnel have been notified/reminded of the 30 day prompt payment policy.

## **Responsible Party**

Alfredo Chavez, (Acting) Senior Accountant

## **Implementation Date**

July 1, 2010

## **Current Observation**

A review of 20 invoices was conducted to determine if the Environmental Services Department has been paying invoices in a timely manner. The results of our testing are outlined below:

• 20 out of 20 (100%) invoices were properly processed for payment in a timely manner.

## **Status**

**Implemented** 

## **Original Finding 3**

## **Travel Requests are not Reconciled**

Based on our review, the Environmental Services Accounts Payable function is not properly reviewing Travel Requests in 2 out of 3 instances (66%).

Type of Voucher	Number of Vouchers
Non Travel	63
Travel	3
Total	66

- Two of the three travel requests or 66% had the following exceptions when reviewed against the City's Travel Manual.
  - The reconciliation calculations were incorrect as follows:
    - > Three meals were not prorated for travel days as required by the City's Travel Policy.
    - > Two travel requests had miscellaneous expenses of \$10.00 charged with no receipts to support the expense.
  - o Monies due the City of El Paso that were not paid by the employee within the ten days of return as required by the City's Travel Manual where:
    - > \$21.20 due for travel request #1 which is 149 days past due as of 3/19/2010.
    - > \$24.20 due for travel request #2 which is 120 days past due as of 3/19/2010.
  - o Motor vehicle rental sales taxes of \$9.08 were paid on a rental car contract. The City of El Paso is exempt from sales tax under Texas Tax Code section 152.084.

## **Recommendation**

The Environmental Service's Employee should reimburse the City of El Paso \$45.40 for their travel related expenses.

Environmental Services should comply with the City of El Paso's Travel Manual requirements for meal calculations, receipt requirements, and employee reimbursements.

Environmental Services should review its travel related expense on car rentals to avoid payment of State Sales Taxes.

## **Management's Response**

Travel requests referenced above were reconciled and overpayments (as calculated at the time) were reimbursed to the city prior to the 3/19/2010 audit date. The above reference to: "monies due the City of El Paso" represent a recalculation of per diem amounts and disallowed miscellaneous charges. Environmental Services did not use flight schedules when calculating per diems and consequently over advanced the employee. This was a systemic error identified through audit. In the absence of a full review of all prior department travel reconciliations it would be discriminatory to single out this individual for repayment thus resulting in selective enforcement of the rules.

It is the department's opinion that the miscellaneous charges without receipts are legitimate charges and do not require reimbursement from the employee. Per the COEP's 2007 Travel Manual, "Porter services or tips shall only be what is reasonable and necessary and should not exceed \$10.00 total. Items under this limit shall not require any receipts". In accordance with this directive, Environmental Services does not require receipts for incidentals less than \$10.00 and has not deviated from the manuals directives. As such no further action is required.

Appropriate staff has been advised of these findings. Additional training to include overall review of the City of El Paso travel manual, per diem prorating, and sales tax exemption rules will be conducted. Additional staff will be cross trained and designated as back-up for travel reconciliations to facilitate timely review.

#### Responsible Party

Deborah Strom, Department Administrative Manager

## **Implementation Date**

June 3, 2010

## **Chief Internal Auditor's Response**

In reviewing the Travel Requests in question, there is no indication that the \$10.00 was paid for baggage handling. The only support provided is that the \$10.00 was a <u>Miscellaneous Expense</u>. Also noted is that the employee was paid a Per Diem rate of \$56.00 and \$71.00 respectively, which should reimburse the employee for meals and incidentals (tips). Therefore the employee is not entitled to claim the additional \$10.00 for baggage handling.

The Environmental Services Department needs to be more critical in their calculation of Per Diem rates and reimbursements to employees in the future. The amounts in question are minimal but could represent a more significant issue in the way travel expenses are handled by the Environmental Services Department.

## **Current Observation**

Two Travel Requests were tested to determine if the Environmental Services Department is properly reviewing Travel Requests and complying with the requirements stated in the City of El Paso Travel Manual. The results of our testing are outlined below:

- Two out of two (100%) Travel Requests included a Miscellaneous Expense of \$10.00 with no receipt(s) to support the expense. It appears that the \$10.00 is for Tips and Baggage Handling. Included in these two Travel Requests were Per Diem rates of \$213.00 and \$122.00, respectively, for Meals and Incidental Expenses. The \$10.00 allowance for Tips or Baggage Handling is already included in the Per Diem rates, per GSA Guidelines. Therefore, the \$10.00 Miscellaneous Expenses is an unallowable expense.
- Two out of two (100%) Travel Requests were not approved by the employee's supervisor after the travel was completed.
- One out of two (50%) Travel Requests was not approved by the employee's supervisor before the travel was performed. Approval was obtained 26 days after the return date.
- One out of two (50%) Travel Requests had the amount due to the employee for Meals and Incidental Expenses calculated incorrectly. The calculated amount was understated by \$8.30.
- One out of two (50%) Travel Requests was not reconciled after the travel was completed.

## **Status**

In Progress – A second Follow-Up Audit will be conducted in this area.

## **Original Finding 4**

#### **Invoices**

Supervisors or authorizing officials are not reviewing invoices for compliance with quoted prices prior to payment.

Invoice # *	X15715201
Vendor	<u>amec</u>
Management Approval Stamped and Signed	Yes
Amount Due	\$73,469.99
<b>Amount Due After Review of Contracted Amounts</b>	\$72,416.12
Difference **	\$1,053.87
Net Overpayment ***	\$462.28

<sup>\*</sup> This invoice was not paid promptly and included in the calculation for finding #2.

<sup>\*\*</sup> While reviewing amounts on invoices against amounts listed in the contracts one exception was noted from the selected sample. Invoice # X15715201, from a vendor named <u>amec</u>, we indentified where the hourly rates for a Clerk 1 and Clerk 2 position were misapplied resulting in an over charge of \$67.50. Also, we were unable to locate support documentation for an equipment rental charge of \$986.37. The result was an over charge of \$1,053.87 or 1.43% of the invoice amount of \$73,469.99.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Environmental Services Accounts Payable made an attempt to collect the \$1,053.87 but an employee calculation error resulted in an overpayment to the vendor of \$462.28.

## Recommendation

Environmental Services Accounts Payable function should comply with the City of El Paso's Accounts Payable Manual section 3.0 paragraph 3, which requires invoices to be reviewed for compliance with quoted prices prior to payment. The supervisor, or authorizing official, should sign off on the document to ensure that there is evidence of compliance with the contract or quoted prices.

## **Management's Response**

The supervisor or authorized personnel will review invoices for compliance with quoted prices prior to approval for payment. Accounts Payable clerks will then re-calculate all invoices. Any invoice that conflicts with quoted prices will be rejected and returned to vendor for reinvoicing. The replacement invoice will have to be issued with a current date. Engineering has all the Environmental Contracts now available in multiple areas. The electronic version is found in Engineering Documents and Records (P:\ENGINEERING DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS\1000GeneralCityFacilities) and three hardcopies are available: in the Engineering Library; the Engineering Files; and in the finance division of ESD. ESD's Engineering division currently scans all contracts to the P-drive allowing access to confirm quoted prices based on contract terms.

## **Responsible Party**

Accounts payable oversight - Alfredo Chavez, (Acting) Senior Accountant Engineering contract compliance – Miguel Parra, Engineering Division Manager

## **Implementation Date**

June 1, 2010

## **Current Observation**

A review of 20 invoices was conducted to determine if Environmental Services' supervisors or authorized officials were reviewing invoices for compliance with quoted prices prior to payment. The results of our testing are outlined below:

- 19 out of 20 (95%) invoices were properly reviewed and consistent with quoted prices, where applicable.
- 1 out of 20 (5%) invoices was not in compliance with quoted prices.
  - The rate charged per unit on the invoice was \$0.60 instead of the quoted price of \$0.50 per unit. The result of the price difference was an overpayment of \$15.00. The overpayment identified is considered immaterial when compared to the total amount reviewed of \$157.997.00. No additional follow up will be conducted.

## **Status**

**Implemented** 

#### INHERENT LIMITATIONS

Because of the inherent limitations of internal controls, errors or irregularities may occur and not be detected. Also, projections of any evaluation of the internal control structure to future periods are subject to the risk that procedures may become inadequate due to changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the procedures may deteriorate.

#### **CONCLUSION**

We have concluded our audit work on the objectives of the Follow-Up Audit – Environmental Services Accounts Payable Audit. Based on the results of our review, we have determined that three (3) of the original findings have been implemented and one (1) is still in progress of being fully implemented.

A second Follow-Up Audit will be scheduled to review Travel Requests completed by the Environmental Services Department's staff.

We wish to thank the Environmental Services' Management and Staff for their assistance and courtesies extended during the completion of this Follow-Up Audit.

Signature on File	Signature on File
Edmundo S. Calderón, CIA, CGAP, CRMA, MBA	Miguel A. Ortega,
Chief Internal Auditor	Auditor

#### Distribution:

Legislative Review Committee – Finance, Internal Audit, Engineering/CIP & Management Services Joyce A. Wilson, City Manager William F. Studer Jr., Deputy City Manager David R. Almonte, Deputy City Manager Carmen Arrieta-Candelaria, Chief Financial Officer